Dear FCC, On behalf of consumers residing in 24-northeastern counties in California,

we strongly support NECA's recommendations for the VRS rate of \$14.023 to be Endorsed by the FCC as "final." The cost of services tabulated by providers of VRS, averaged out, proved to NECA the necessity of having a higher rate. This rate may not even be high enough for some VRS providers, however, we trust the

experts and comments from Sprint, as well as CSD (pioneer and trendsetter of VRS).

Specifically, history has demonstrated whereby new services trends started off with high

costs of rates with any Telecommunication products approved for the general public, why

should the issue over VRS rates be any different? We fail to understand the FCC's rationale

by singling out VRS issue all of a sudden? We feel the FCC has an obligation to disclose its

source for doing an off-the wall investigation when it traditionally has not been their place to do

so all these years. Where were you when the TTY Relay first began? Costs were higher at

the onset, and changed over the years downward. Hence, we are of the opinion that the

FCC's concern is weak, and frankly premature. Furthermore, HOVRS's explanation with

special mention of the high costs related to astronomically high maintenance of

software/upgrades/IT services, and Interpreters fees, are indeed a valid points whereby

nonprofit agencies like NorCal are NOT in the VRS business for that very reason!

Until the day interpreters nationally relinquish their demand for the high fees they bill

us for (and by which the FCC has no control of, likewise those of us who serve the

Deaf population), we are stuck paying these high costs! Point in case, the demand for

Interpreters for VRS is an even higher rate due to the special needs and high tech

requirements. Therefore, we request that justification for this rate provided to

the FCC by such experts be endorsed as valid, and that the NECA's rate aforementioned,

be stamped "approved."

Last but not least, our concern still lays with the inaccessibility and violation

of several laws should this rate not be corrected. Currently, VRS hours of operations

has been reduced, and thus places the FCC in further jeopardy and highly vulnerable to

potential lawsuits, should something traumatic happens during the hours when VRS is not

in operation.By way of example: a deaf child in Sacramento, California, not being able to

use VRS (due to shut down of services at 3am because of the flaws in FCC's low rates) to $\,$

call 911 because the child's single parent (a deaf mother) just had a heart

attack and died as a result. Ultimately, the FCC would be held liable. Meanwhile, the clock is ticking... Thank you, Sheri Farinha Mutti, CEONorCal Center on Deafness, Inc. 4708 Roseville Road, Suite 112Sacramento, CA 95660Email: Sfmutti@norcalcenter.orgor SFMXO@aol.com -----1061843748 Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII" Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable <HTML><HEAD> <META charset=3DUTF-8 http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; charse</pre> t=3Dutf-8"><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2600.0" name=3DGENERATOR></HEAD> <BODY style=3D"FONT-SIZE: 14pt; FONT-FAMILY: Arial; BACKGROUND-COLOR: #ffffff</pre> f"> <DIV>ECFS - E-mail Filing
<PROCEEDING>98-67
<DATE>8/25/03 BR><NAME> Sheri Farinha Mutti
<ADDRESS1>4708 Roseville Rd., S uite 112
<ADDRESS2>
<CITY&qt;No. Highlands
<STATE&qt;CA
<ZIP&qt;95660
<LAW-FIRM&qt;
<ATTORNEY&qt;
<FILE-NUM BER&qt;
< DOCUMENT-TYPE&qt; RC
< PHONE-NUMBER&qt; 916-349-7500
&l t;DESCRIPTION&qt;Email Comment
<CONTACT-EMAIL&qt;Sfmxo@aol.com
< TEXT&qt;Dear FCC,</DIV> <DIV><PRE> On behalf of consumer s residing in 24-northeastern counties in California, </PRE><PRE><FON T face=3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2>we strongly support NECA's r ecommendations for the VRS rate of \$14.023 to be </PRE><PRE> Endorsed by the FCC as " final." The cost of services tabulated by providers </PRE><FENT face=3DArial col or=3D#000080 size=3D2>of VRS, averaged out, proved to NECA the necessity of=20 having a higher rate. </PRE><PRE>This rate may not even be high enough for some VRS providers, howeve r, we trust the </PRE><PRE>experts and comments from Sprint, as well as CSD (pioneer and trendsett er of VRS). </PRE><PRE>Sp ecifically, history has demonstrated whereby new services trends started off with high </PRE>< PRE>costs of rates with any Telecommunication products ap proved for the general public, why</PRE><PRE>should the issue over VRS rates be any different? We fa il to understand the FCC's rationale </PRE><PRE>by singling out VRS issue all of a sudden? We feel the FCC has an obligation t o disclose its </PRE><PRE>source for doing an off-the wall investigation when it traditionally=20 has not been their place to do</PRE><PRE><F ONT color=3D#000080 size=3D2> so all these years. Where were you when the TTY Relay fi rst began? Costs w ere higher at </PRE><PRE> the onset, and <FO NT face=3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2>changed over the years downward. </

FONT>Hence, we are of the opinio n that the </PRE><PRE>FCC

's concern is weak, </FON T>and frankly premature. Further more, HOVRS's explanation with </PRE><PRE>special=20 mention of the high costs related to astronomically high maintenance of =3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2>software/upgrades/IT services, and Interpreters fees, are<FO NT face=3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2> indeed a valid points whereby </FO NT></PRE><PRE>nonprofit < FONT face=3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2>agencies like NorCal are NOT in t he VRS business for that very reason! </PRE><PRE>Until the day interpreters nationally relinquish their demand for the </FON T>high fees they bill </P RE><PRE>us for (and by which the FCC has no control of, likewise those of us who serve the </PRE><PRE>Deaf population), we are stuck paying these high costs! Point in case, the demand for </PRE><PRE>Inte rpreters for VRS is an ev en higher rate due to the special needs and high tech </PRE><PRE>requirements. Therefore, we request that justification for this rate provided to </FO NT></PRE><PRE>the FCC by such </ FONT>experts be endorsed as vali d, and that the NECA's ra te aforementioned, </PRE><PRE>be stamped "approved ."</PRE><PRE>Last but not least, our conce rn still lays with the inaccessibility and violation </PRE><PRE><FON T face=3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2>of several laws should this rate not be corrected. Currently, VRS hours of operations </PRE><PRE>has been reduced, and thus pl aces the FCC in further jeopardy and highly vulnerable to </PRE><PRE>potential lawsuits, should som ething traumatic happens during the hours when VRS is not </PRE><PRE>in operation.By way of example: a deaf child in Sacramento, California, not being able to </PRE><PR E>use VRS (due to shut down of services at 3am <FO NT face=3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2>because of the flaws in FCC's low r ates) to </PRE><PR E>call 911 because <FONT=20 face=3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2>the child's single parent (a deaf moth
er) just had a heart attack and died as </PRE><PRE><FONT face=3DArial
 color=3D#000080 size=3D2>a result. <FONT face=3DArial color=3D#00008
0 size=3D2>Ultimately, the FCC would be held liable. </PRE><PRE><FON
T face=3DArial color=3D#000080 size=3D2>Meanwhile, the clock is ticking...</
FONT></PRE><PRE>Thank you,</PRE><PRE><FONT lang=3D0 face=3D"Californian FB" color=3D#008000 size=3D3=20
FAMILY=3D"SERIF" PTSIZE=3D"12">Sheri Farinha Mutti, CEO
NorCal Center on=20
Deafness, Inc.
4708 Roseville Road, Suite 112
Sacramento, CA 95660

Email: Sfmutti@norcalcenter.org
or SFMXO@aol.com<FONT lang=3D0 fac
e=3DArial color=3D#800000 size=3D2 FAMILY=3D"SANSSERIF" PTSIZE=3D"10">
</PRE></DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----1061843748--